

**MANDAN REMEDIATION TRUST (MRT)**  
**July 7, 2009 Minutes**

**Meeting:** 191<sup>st</sup> Official Meeting  
**Date:** July 7, 2009  
**Location:** Mandan City Hall, 205 2nd Ave. NW  
**Time:** 1:37 P.M.

The MRT meeting was called to order by Jim Neubauer. Fritz Schwindt and Dave Glatt were present. Also present were Scott Radig and Marilyn Mertz, State Department of Health; Ellen Huber, city of Mandan; Tim Kenyon and Ken Kytta, LBG.

**Bank Statement.** Neubauer acknowledged the receipt of the Bank of North Dakota bank statement for the MRT. It is showing a balance of \$9,379,983.72 on June 30, 2009. That includes a \$300,000 CD that was due July 6, 2009 and a \$9 million CD that is due on November 2, 2009 at the rate of 1 percent. Motion is not required.

**Brady Martz.** Neubauer received a Brady Martz bill for the audit and tax return in the amount of about \$1,500 and one for the SEP for about \$400. A review will be done.

**Certificate of Liability Insurance (CLI).** Neubauer received a CLI from R. J. Ahmann insuring Control Assemblies Company with an effective date of July 1, 2009 to July 1, 2010.

**Plant Warranty.** Neubauer talked to Ulteig about the plant material around the fountain area. MRT talked to them last year about replacing some of the dead material. They sent a letter July 14, 2008. He does not know if any of the plants have been replaced since that time. A. J. Wallevand sent a letter to Robert Cahonit with Associated Builders.

**Pay Request.** Reimbursement to the city of Mandan in the amount of \$1,425.93 for wastewater charges through May 31, 2009. They have received a payment of \$1,622 based on the last billing we have so this would be the most current.

**Motion.** Glatt moved and Schwindt seconded to approve payment to the city of Mandan for \$1,425.93, request number 176. All ayes. Motion carried.

**Mandan's Quarterly Billing.** Neubauer has received the city's quarterly bill from the city for some of the remediation, electricity, etc. on the buildings in the amount of \$26,000 [\$27,325.65]. Radig will review.

**Brady Martz.** We did pay Brady Martz \$3,425 on February 5, 2009. Neubauer will review his file.

**OMB Audit.** Glatt received an e-mail from OMB saying MRT should be thinking about the next audit.

**Pay Request.** Pay Request No. 177 to LBG for payment of \$39,152.89. Radig has reviewed. All the charges are within the approved task amounts. Discussed. Under O&M there are charges for R3 for \$8,800. What are they doing? Kytta explained it was their two-time visit for general O&M for some cleaning and going through the RTO unit when they were here. Also, they did some replumbing for optimizing the system. That is done twice a year and is in the budget. Radig indicated the approved budgeted amount was \$300,000 and they are under the projections for the year. LBG had some engineers up here as a periodic visit.

**Motion.** Glatt moved and Schwindt seconded to approve the June 8, 2009-invoice to LBG in the amount of \$39,152.89. All ayes. Motion carried.

**Minutes.** Discussed MRT's June 2, 2009 minutes. Revisions were made.

**Motion.** Glatt moved and Schwindt seconded to approve the June 2, 2009 minutes, as amended. All ayes. Motion carried.

**Century 21 Building.** The Kevin Ritterman project to clean and fix up the wall on the old Century 21 building the bids are as follows: Community Contractors -- \$12,100; and G W & Sons Construction, Grand Forks, N.D. -- \$13,500. The work is for removing tar and tuck pointing the brick on the north side of the building. Community Contractors bid is broken down but the G W & Sons Construction bid is a lump sum for removal of tar in the area and to tuck the joints back with mortar. Community Contractors bid is cleaning with dry ice for \$3,000; tuck pointing, mortar joints for \$5,000; risk insurance and temporary toilet for \$1,000 and supervision up to \$2,000. That includes overhead and profit 10 percent or \$1,100 onto that for a total of \$12,100.

Huber indicated the Community Contractors bid includes sub contractors. There were two: Blast and Blast Pro of Mandan, and S Y Cleaning and Restoration of Bismarck. One for \$3,004 and another in the range of \$2,150 to \$3,000 for cleaning tar. Schwindt indicated he thought the MRT's responsibility was to remove the tar. He does not know where the tuck pointing comes in. Neubauer referred to the theater wall work. There is some concern over the \$2,000 supervision and \$500 field engineering and temporary starting the system. Unless you want to counter with something.

Huber indicates that lump sum bids are very common. She provided comments

about the amounts and the bid that did not breakout specific amounts.

Schwindt asked. Is this the last expense we have on these buildings?

Huber is not aware of any other exposed walls.

Kevin Ritterman is from Grand Forks. Community Contractors operates out of Grand Forks. Community Contractors is going to be a partner in the building that he builds at 200 west Main. They did the Library II project. They are doing this project. They moved their project supervisor to Mandan permanently. He purchased a home here. She thinks there are subs in at least one of the bids. He cannot supervise the project personally himself so he is very comfortable having a contractor do that for him. He has lined up subs to do that work and oversight.

Discussed exterior tar removal and extra wall repair. Schwindt did not know we had to repair the outside wall. Huber explained it goes back to the spirit of architectural review standards that were put in place where if you tear down a building and it exposes a wall, the remaining wall must be visually acceptable. The architectural review committee has already approved it.

Glatt asked if they would be coming back and saying they would need it green. Huber indicated if they did that it would be between Dakota Commercial and the development company.

Neubauer will draft a letter for their signature regarding no further claims.

**Motion.** Glatt moved and Schwindt seconded to approve \$12,100 for the tar removal and tuck pointing the north wall of the former Century 21 building contingent upon an agreement with the new owner that this is the last claim they will have from the MRT. All ayes. Motion carried.

Kenyon was here on June 9, 2009 for a meeting with the MRT. Those minutes are being drafted.

The cost for initial costs back with LBG for Morton County was \$17,700 for the investigation into what lies beneath the floor of the LEC and the potential remedy. There was discussion on what the MRT would potentially share in that cost.

Schwindt recalls talking generally about sharing in that particular cost. Neubauer thought it was about \$5,000. He will review the minutes. During the June 9 meeting, the county asked if they could get some help with the costs. Part of that investigation would be not only the groundwater but also the fuel seepage. Schwindt and Glatt

recalled other costs, than they would figure what the MRT would pay on the stuff. It had to do more with what the final remedy control would be. No dollar amounts were discussed.

**Department.** Radig referenced the recent memo from LBG. Kenyon and Kytta will talk about that.

**LBG.** Kenyon received a thumbs up on the Main Street work last time. That thumbs up was contingent upon getting the final costs from the contractor, which he didn't have. He indicated next time he would bring the authorization package with. It does have the final contractor cost. The one Kenyon presented last month was \$229,345 and this one is \$222,674. It went down \$7,000. Some of the duplication was removed.

**R3.** Schwindt noted there was no change in R3's bid. Theoretically, we were led to believe that there were going to be some changes in prices if they had more time to do the work and there was none. Kytta noted it was \$4,000 less. It went from \$88,000 to 84,000. Schwindt indicated it might be some of the duplication but if you look at the prices per unit that is in there, they are the same. Kytta indicated it was a lot less than Earthmovers. Schwindt noted, so we could have done it back in April and it would have been the same.

Discussed the bid. MRT approved the task order on June 9, 2009 with the caveat that he would get whatever the final price was worth.

**Product Recovery.** Kenyon provided handouts of product recovery numbers. LBG has not seen any movement in the free product during the last few months. This last month 708 gallons of sellable free product and 2,620 gallons of sludge were sold. That is free product that is sequestered in the system that has gone out.

**Sludge.** The sludge recovery is over a three-month period as opposed to every two weeks. It is the second pick up this year. This also incorporates the bio attenuation calculation numbers.

**Vapor.** The vapor phase numbers have been decreasing all along.

**Start Date.** The prepacked screens will be in on July 13, 2009. They should be on schedule. The work on Main Street will start either on July 27, 2009 or the first week of August.

**Sidewalk Restoration.** Kenyon indicated there was some talk about the city contractor doing the sidewalk restoration instead of LBG's guy. He indicated if the city contractor wants to do the sidewalk, it was OK with him. Schwindt checked with the city

engineering department and they were going to check with the contractor. He did not receive a price from them. Kytta has talked to Bob Kruck and there has been discussion of that. In here, R3's bid is \$7 per square foot for sidewalk replacement. A couple of years ago the city contractor was significantly less than that.

**Site Strategy Plan (SSP) and Shut Down.** Last time Kenyon was here he talked about SSP and shut down. He also e-mailed it. Hard copies are available. Kenyon will summarize it. North of First Street with the exception of two-hundredth of a foot in one well there is no free product and there hasn't been for a while. Some wells are more persistent in the absence of free product than some others but in all of them with that one exception which isn't a recovery well. It is Monitor Well (MW) 8. There is no free product. This memo augments the draft SSP in terms of when to shut things off and how to shut things off. From a very practical standpoint this has already been implemented. LBG is not doing MPE on wells that don't have free product on them. But this is somewhat a formalization of this process. You take the first step before you take the second and third. The next step past this is you monitor it and make sure it doesn't rebound and come back, make sure the water levels are appropriate; so far they are. According to the water elevation that we picked several years ago based on historical data 1,629 is the correct feet elevation. We're good with that.

The next step would be SVE operation to a certain extent. We are kind of already doing that. We are not doing SVE on those fringe wells. It doesn't make any sense to do it. That is the formalization of that process. So this is the first part of the initiation of the shutdown of the system where areas are complete in their remediation.

The SSP talks about doing it on a systemwide basis. The SSP is a building by building basis. When the SSP was written, the entire system (4 to 6 buildings) really hadn't been designed yet. Now it makes sense to do it on a remote manifold by manifold basis. What they are talking about is implementing that MPE shutdown on all wells except MW 1309 which is the remedial well directly adjacent to MW 8 and monitor the product until it is gone. It is a very soft shutdown because there is nothing that is going to happen that would preclude it from starting back up from this point. When they go to the next phase and SVE is shutdown, than you all have a decision to make on abandonment of system components that you can't go back from action. There is a lot of mileage to be made from this as well. You would also appreciate the political mileage that comes with this but there is possibly developer mileage that could come from this as well. Some of the remediation is done. Some of the system is initiating shutdown procedure. That has to be good news on that front as well. From a practical standpoint, but not a formal standpoint, we are already doing this. This certainly predisposes the draft SSP which is the document that this leads to. The state is in the process of reviewing that.

Glatt indicated they will be going out for public comment as well. Basically, it will

identify endpoint and communicate that when we meet those endpoints we are done. We feel we need some public input into that process or at least an acknowledgment of what is going on. Our plan is to have that done by the end of the year. It doesn't mean we are ending the remediation, it just means we are going to a different phase. In my mind, the SSP that we will be looking at will be when are we done with remediation? When can we say we no longer need LBG?

Neubauer indicated with the SSP we would be looking for public input on that. It would be more defining the endpoint than how we get to that endpoint.

Kenyon noted that this is more of a validation of process than the endpoint. That's why we did it now. We are very sensitive to people coming to us and saying how much longer is this going to run here? This represents 25 percent of the system Kytta added. The widespread product wasn't there. The system began in September 2007. The longest one running started in April 2006 which is south of Main Street. Kenyon noted two years is a good time frame.

Schwindt indicated we do have wells in the LEC but they don't show anything as far as free product. They are talking endpoint of remediation. LBG is proposing to continue the SVE in all of these areas for now. That is the way it was outlined in the SSP. Kenyon confirmed we are already doing this – this is validation.

One of the purposes for this as well, Kenyon indicated we have quite a number of SVE blowers. It makes more sense to run one at high capacity than several at low capacity from a standpoint of wear and tear and electric consumption. What this whole process tells us you are OK with – do a little bit of replumbing, take some of those offline, its an O&M cost. We don't want to do that unilaterally without some kind of notification. This sets that in motion.

Kytta explained further. What we would like to eventually get down to as mentioned earlier is a lot of the perimeter wells were not operating as heavy a vacuum flow for SVE. We are getting down to where we are choking the blowers down. We have a total of seven blowers throughout the system. Just looking at the buildings and the configuration, is to get from seven blowers operating down to four and essentially instead of having two blowers choked down you have one running at full capacity. But it would be plumbed such that you could operate on either blower so that if you had issues maintenance wise or what not you could switch over to the other blower. You could even cycle them back and forth so they both get some operating time. That has the net gain of reducing the amount of electricity because it is a lot cheaper to run one at full capacity than to run two.

Glatt agreed we need to have that flexibility. Kytta says the MPE – they are

different compressors. You still have that capacity to go back and operate those if need be. The flexibility will be retained.

Kenyon indicated as this process comes to fruition some of that flexibility would go away as for instance, the manifolds north of First Street would be the first ones gone and those remote manifolds could go away. You could abandon some components of that system. So this is the first step to that ladder. They will monitor until 2010 for free product. They will monitor through the first quarter. If the water levels stay down this winter, that is the most advantageous time for it to show up before the spring rise. If it hadn't come back then or in that MW 8 it hasn't changed substantially. There is some judgment to be exercised there. You don't want to put a numerical criteria on that. That way we would look forward to the next phase of the shutdown process.

**SVE.** Do you currently operate the system where you cycle SVE from one manifold to the next or are they all running pretty much continuously? Kytta indicated they are pretty much running continuously. We do some cycling of flow rates throughout. Early on we were doing more cycling when we had more capacity to work with. Now, because we have so many clean wells out on the periphery there is not as much a capacity for cycling, which is another reason why we want to go with less blowers because there is more flexibility of switching around flow rates because right now we can't switch the flow rates around a whole lot because we are at the lower capacity of the blower operation. Rather than operating the SVE continuously over these things, would it make sense to cycle the SVE over all of the wells north of First Street so you are drawing on or doing SVE on each well once a month for four days or whatever.

Kenyon explained that would be part of the next phase that's why I say this is the first step that initiates that process. Kytta added we are a little early for pulsing. Part of the SVE shutdown is if you shut it off and see what the rebound is and hit it and see how quick the rebound goes away.

Schwindt is OK with this basic approach as long as they continue to do MPE where we have that free product. Kenyon noted it is conditional on that one well. The reason we brought this now is if we wait until 2010 to start this; once you do that shutdown according to the SSP you have got to build the monitoring data to go to the next step. We just as soon start that now then wait another six months. That's why we are bringing this now. Schwindt would like to see if you discontinue the free product monitoring in the first quarter of 2010, periodically after that I would like to see annually to go back in and check those again. Kenyon said. "The SSP does not contemplate that." The hazard there is then you have to leave this whole system sitting there in moth balls in case something happens in the end. The SSP proposes when it has reached the asymptote or is gone for a period of time it is done and you don't go back and look. The fact of the matter is there is enough data to show that chances are it is not coming back, Glatt explained.

Schwindt is concerned about that. He would like to have as much good data as we can get as long as we are operating the rest of the system and if we go back and check those periodically, I don't see where that hurts anything.

**Modification.** That should be done as a modification to the SSP, Kenyon said. Glatt explained that you would be shutting down your site in phases or sections and at the very end come back because there is risk there. I understand that. Everything is done. Kenyon agreed there is a risk as well not only if the regulatory agency is saying you have to start up but someone in the public coming back and saying here's a provision in the SSP and we are going to push you to continue to do that. That would become very expensive because it would require keeping this whole system moth balled and ready to go should that eventually arrive. Glatt indicated after we shut it down for a period of time of six months or two years whatever the state is comfortable there may be a mothball period.

North of First Street, Kenyon indicated, under that scenario we would have to keep that ready for remediation, not the entire system. Glatt responded, but a different time clock. As we move south that gets into the same condition that north is now. That clock would start. You would be getting chunks of land saying OK we are done. Kenyon added that has a corollary benefit relative to redevelopment if we had a manifold, for instance the one at Ratz, where there is one or two wells that have product. One that is very persistent. Let's shutdown that area except for that well and that would allow us to conceivably abandon those wells and not have that as a further impediment to redevelopment. It's a time frame but you start the clock. Those are some of the reasons why Glatt would like public comment.

Kenyon asked for approval of this so we can get this clock ticking. Certainly, there may be some conditional approval – pending review of site safety strategy plan and public comment. Glatt doesn't object to the process and doesn't object to the monitoring. As far as the final endpoint, we haven't decided. In the process and remediation it makes sense. What do you feel comfortable with in the community? This is what we feel comfortable with the state.

What we would request is that MRT approve this and submit it to the state for official Department review, Kenyon said.

Schwindt is still concerned about continuing to do some monitoring as long as we have the system in place I would rather err on restarting the system than having that as a jeopardy vs. 10 years from now when they start digging a hole out here and we have free product again. We decided we weren't going to monitor anymore. Kenyon indicated that is going to happen. I can almost guarantee that someone is going to dig a hole and find something.

From the state's perspective we knew we weren't going to get back to pristine conditions but we want to get to a level where it didn't pose a health risk to the public. Glatt said. He doesn't have a problem with having to submit it to the Department. It will be reviewed and comments will be provided.

Neubauer asked. Is there any guidance as far as how long do we have to keep coming back? The SSP has one to four clean monitoring events and it has been two years and nothing is there. How much is enough? Kenyon stated.

Kenyon indicated that is why the SSP for groundwater elevation for asymptotic recovery or asymptotic presence are gone. That's why that criteria was set up so you wouldn't get into that very situation.

Schwindt can see it being a benefit to continue the monitoring in this area up here going forward. If we say we are clean up here and don't monitor anymore, then you don't have anything to back you up. When we get down to the dirtier part of the spill, if we have done additional monitoring for a longer period of time in the other area then when we say we are clean down here then we have some experience to base it on rather than just meeting the criteria. That's good enough but we didn't go back and check. We handled the facilities up north. We have all the monitoring wells. We have the system. Why not continue checking it? Just because we continue to monitor up here beyond what we said doesn't necessarily mean that we have to do that down here where we are going to continue cleaning up.

Kenyon indicated if I am one of your public opponents, I would take the opposite viewpoint of that so you monitor up there a long time and you are not down here where it is worse. How come?

Schwindt responded, because we proved it was successful up here.

Neubauer sees the issue: 1) You are asking us to approve that so it can be submitted to the state for consideration of regulatory review. 2) It then allows you to go and do some additional reworking, replumbing of the system to make it more sufficient. It doesn't mean we can't go back in and say OK we have to operate this for the last six months. It is not going to prevent us from doing that should we have to do that.

Kenyon indicated those are kind of separate issues. The replumbing we will probably do that as part of O&M because that's the way it works. They are not completely disassociated.

Glatt sees it as now we have to say, when will we be done? How do we justify that? And come up with something rational that the state can live with because the state

is on the hook. So we will be very conservative. I do see some pressures from other interests. The sooner we call it quits, the sooner we can get any left over money back into some place. We will be moving cautiously as we move forward. I appreciate coming forward with it now to get that issue moving.

Kenyon noted a long time ago we realized there would be some seriously competing interests. That object of shutdown criteria would serve toward at least not give them something to complain about on either side.

According to Glatt, from a state perspective, wherever we draw that line we are going to feel comfortable with it and probably do more than the controllers say we should do just to add that extra layer of protection.

On sites where the stopping point is something above groundwater quality standards that's the toughest decision you guys always have. How clean is clean enough?

Glatt does not object to the process you are going through now or going to the second step of replumbing of the operational areas. I would say go ahead and do that. Some of the nuances as far as monitoring, etc. we may still want to discuss but as far as making those operational things. . . .

Schwindt and Neubauer do not have any objection either to the Health Department for its review. Do we need one of those? Glatt said, "We are acknowledging in the minutes that we received it." Kenyon added. And we submitted it today.

Kenyon reported the system is running well.

**North First Street.** LBG would like to wait to see what kind of reaction is received for this area. Kytta indicated they haven't really looked at any other manifolds south of First Street. That is LBG's next step. Kenyon stated we don't have the vested interest that the state and city do on the preservation of the fund but it is a big thing on our calendar and this is part of that.

SVE is still being done east of the old Mandan Motors. Rusty Krikava would know how much SVE they are doing.

**Railyard Plume.** Krikava would know if there is much of a plume from the railyard. Kytta noted one of the long-term concerns along the railyard is: Are we going to keep pulling product there? Kenyon indicated they will pull that until it reaches the equilibrium.

Can you tell by manifold areas that you are getting more product in one area than

another? Kytta responded. You really can't tell because it all comes into the same system. Krikava has a feel for which wells are the good ones if he is there when they are operating.

Are we seeing a drop off in free product recovery from those wells that border the Burlington Northern property? Kytta indicated LBG doesn't know other than their free product recovery numbers, which are holding, which is interesting. If you go back even a year ago when we talked about system operation trying to get hot spots for development. We are at a point now from an MPE standpoint any place that has product we are operating and we have been there for a while.

Kenyon noted, at MRT's request we can go back and look at other manifolds that are a candidate with this very same process. We can do that. This was done with your approval last month. If you like, we can literally bring you on next month.

Neubauer would be more inclined to have the Health Department put their thoughts into this before we recreate a document and then have them come back and say this is not what we are looking for. Let's look for something else.

Then we know what you are looking for next time indicated Kytta.

**City Council.** LBG will present this at the council meeting tonight. It is a public document. It is the first step in several steps. It is not that we are done. Kenyon will explain that at the beginning of the project, we drafted a document called the SSP. That document describes how the system will be shut down and how clean is clean - when it is clean enough. It is a very measured process that will take a year to two years at least and we have just taken the first initial step in that two-year process. Does that mean the system is going to be entirely gone in two years? No, it does not because it is on a phased approach. Just like we started it up on a phased approach, it goes away on a phased approach. This is just the very first phase in that approach. And the SSP will come up for comment later this calendar year Kenyon added. LBG will present the following at the city council meeting tonight: free product numbers, Main Street work later this month, and the shut down process.

**Work.** Well drilling will begin the week of July 27 or August.

**Public Comment on SSP.** Kytta asked about dates to receive public comment on the SSP. Kenyon noted this document talks about some changes to that SSP manifold by manifold, for example. Should we update that for you first? Glatt agreed and suggested by the next meeting they should be coming up with a new time line to get public input. It would be more of a cleanup nature rather than substance, Kenyon said.

Schwindt noted that Kytta had made some comments on the SSP before. He suggested that LBG just draft a couple of paragraphs rather than update the entire document.

**Meeting Costs.** Kenyon talked about splitting his mobilization costs for the MRT meetings. Last time it was three ways. This time it was two ways and next time hopefully it will be three ways. Kytta's mobilization now is totally on the landfill. It seems to work out cost effectively for a lot of folks.

**LEC.** Kenyon indicated the LEC did authorize LBG to go forward with the engineering design and bid documents. Kytta is working on that.

Glatt asked. How much are they keeping us informed of what they are doing over there? If they are approving a bunch of things and they come back later and share in the cost. There is a potential for us to be philosophically against some of that. Would that be a problem?

Both Kenyon and Schwindt were at the county commission meeting when LBG gave the report. The work that was authorized -- parts of it seemed like a reasonable approach. By attending the commission meetings, the MRT will be kept informed.

Kenyon indicated when those bid documents come together, it is LBG's intent to separate those things out as line items. There are two pieces. One is because of the water problem and some additional things -- odor control and things that would be done because the diesel is there. Separate out the line items clearly so if there is cost sharing, you won't have to spend a lot of time figuring out what is what.

Schwindt suggested updating exactly what you are proposing over there. That would be helpful.

**MRT Question.** Dave asked. Do you feel comfortable the way the relationship is now moving forward or do we need something more concrete? Schwindt indicated we haven't committed to anything with the county other than we are willing to talk about cost participation. That's really the extent we have gone with the county.

Neubauer's notes from February 3, 2009: During the initial study were there costs to dispose of the cuttings and borings that were stinky because of fuel, etc.? Will they be in addition to how many borings he did – six or seven? Kenyon indicated six. The cost for disposal is such a deminimis cost.

Neubauer thought he had written that the MRT would participate up to \$5,000. Glatt noted once the system is in and then they come back and say the costs are 20 percent of O&M. He would like an understanding. Anticipate to a certain level of remediation. O&M is their responsibility. Neubauer thought part of the discussion on June 9, 2009 was there is a portion of what they are designing for the county that is related to groundwater and there is a portion for the installation of that groundwater dewatering system. If there are extra precautions and extra steps needed to be taken because of the contamination whether it be fumes or disposal of soil that we would talk about cost-sharing on those types of things. We don't have those numbers yet on the ongoing stuff because they are still in process. That would be our initial thoughts on it.

**Oil Water Separator.** Kenyon agreed that it was a very good point. He had not considered the O&M. We talked to you last time about possibly donating your oil water separator that you are not using. It is appropriately sized. If the water should come up enough, the system is needed. It will have to be operated and might be some monitoring of the discharge and nobody knows when that might be or if when, but there would be costs associated with O&M. The oil separator might have to be cleaned occasionally. If we send it over there, it will be cleaned before it leaves. If it runs for four months, it would have to be cleaned, operated, and maintained.

**Contribution.** Neubauer indicated the gist of it is any financial contribution to the LEC by the MRT there would be a written agreement between the MRT and county commission delineating what we are doing and when we are done.

Kytta had a contractor down in that basement the end of last week. Over the years, they looked at vertical wells and horizontal wells. Reinstalling drain tile is by far the most cost-effective. Schwindt talked about putting the little powered vent on like we had with the Berube building under this whole system. It shouldn't cost that much.

Kenyon asked. For the record, are you guys OK with donating the oil water separator. There is value associated with that. Schwindt indicated we aren't using it and haven't been using it over at the treatment building now, right? It was used initially, but is not being used now, Kenyon said. They have found a better way to do it with chemicals and emulsion, etc. Neubauer asked. What is the dollar value associated with it? It looks like new. Glatt suggested if it cost \$15,000 to \$20,000 to buy a new one and we are able to replace it and get you the same functionality there should be some credit given for that.

**MDU Service Connections.** Is there any information on the MDU service connections that are being replaced? Schwindt talked to them after the last meeting and they were replacing most of those that go to the south side of the alley. The impression he got was they were doing that as part of their routine program. There was no mention at all of any kind looking to the city or anybody else for recovery. Because of the corrosion on the one going into George's Bakery, they decided they were going to do a bunch of them.

**Developers.** We haven't heard anything from any developers, Kenyon stated. Huber indicated we are working on plans yet. Our purchase agreement with them require that they dig ground by September 1, 2009, but we haven't closed with them. Would expect building plans, footings and location. This is next to the theater.

**Mandan Hotel.** Huber indicated they have not reached a purchase agreement. They were given an extension to the end of 2009.

**Next Meeting.** August 4, 2009 at 1:30 p.m.

**Motion.** Glatt moved and Schwindt seconded to adjourn. All ayes. Motion carried.